

Application No. 10/716,586
Detailed Action of July 2, 2008

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
AUG 04 2008

182531-0004

Amendments to the Drawings: Please amend, correct, update, and replace the drawings sheets with the following listing of replacement drawing sheets, and with the attached two (2) replacement drawing sheets for following four (4) figures:

Fig. 5C is an overhead cut-away view of another illustration of the present inventive locking device protective cover installed on an access door over an underground access area with the padlock engaged and the protective cover shielding the entire locking device.

Fig. 5D is an overhead cut-away view of another illustration of the present inventive locking device protective cover installed on an access door over an underground access area with the padlock engaged and the protective cover shielding a portion of the locking device.

Fig. 7 is a perspective view of another illustration of the present inventive locking device protective cover installed on an access door over an underground access area with the access door partially open.

Fig. 8 is a perspective view of another illustration of the present inventive locking device protective cover installed on an access door over an underground access area with the access door closed.

Application No. 10/716,586
Detailed Action of July 2, 2008

182531-0004

Remarks/Arguments:

In response to the Detailed Action requesting correction and submission of replacement drawing sheets, applicant submits the following remarks and the two replacement drawing sheets to further support its Response filed on August 14, 2007 and March 31, 2008.

Drawing Objections and Replacement Drawing Sheets

The Office Action objected to certain of the substitute drawings submitted on June 21, 2004. More specifically, the Office Action provided that new matter was presented in Figs. 3, 4, 5A, 5B, and 6. Applicant contends that no new matter was presented in these drawings for the following reasons, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the drawings objections.

One embodiment or specific orientation and location of the hasp 20 and respective aperture 41 in the access door 40 or cover 40 was illustrated in the originally submitted informal drawings. Another embodiment was also illustrated in the later submitted formal drawings. These are two of multiple configurations of the hasp and aperture, all of which are intended to be within the scope of the pending claims. In the replacement Figs. 5C, 5D, 7, and 8, the orientation, location and size of the hasp 20 is shown as illustrated in the originally submitted informal drawings. The substitute Figs. 5A, 5B, 3 and 4, show a different configuration for the hasp 20 orientation, location and size that works as provided in the pending claims and as described in the specification. Where inventive subject matter may be illustrated through different embodiments and different drawings, and in which all of those embodiments are within the scope of the pending claims, then the different drawings do not introduce or provide new matter. Applicant accordingly requests that the drawing rejections be withdrawn. If further explanation of the different embodiments would assist to clarify this issue, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned counsel for such information.

Application No. 10/716,586
Detailed Action of July 2, 2008

182531-0004

Claims 1 and 2 Clarification

Amended claims 1 and 2 reference an "access door" to which the protective shroud is to be affixed, and through which a single hasp element extends. As requested by the Office Action, for clarification purposes, applicant states that the "access door" is not being positively claimed, but is only inferentially claimed as part of the system being locked and to which access is being limited.

Conclusion:

The Examiner is invited to call the applicant's undersigned representative if any further action will expedite the prosecution of the application or if the Examiner has any suggestions or questions concerning the application or the present Response. In fact, if the claims of the application are not believed to be in full condition for allowance, for any reason, the applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner in drafting one or more acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP § 707.07(j) or in making constructive suggestions pursuant to MPEP § 706.03 so that the application can be placed in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin W. Goldstein, Reg. No. 34,608
Attorney for Applicant

KWG:lk

Dated: August 4, 2008

Enclosures: Replacement Drawing Sheets (2) (Figs. 5C & 5D and Figs. 7 & 8)

Stradley Ronon Stevens & Young, LLP
Great Valley Corporate Center
30 Valley Stream Parkway
Malvern, PA 19355-1481
(610) 640-5800

Application No. 10/716,586
Detailed Action of July 2, 2008


182531-0004

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment for any additional fee which may be required or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502951.

Any response in this application requiring a petition for extension of time, but failing to include one, should be treated as though it does include the required petition for extension of time.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. 571-273-8300) on:

August 4, 2008


Linda M. Keller